

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday, September 21, 2000**

The thirty-eighth meeting of the Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) was held on September 21, 2000, at the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, 1116 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Conference Room, Lower Level, Sacramento, California.

**MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT (Based on Sign-In Sheets):**

Paul E Helliker, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)  
Charles Goodman, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)  
Jennifer Ryder Fox, AgraQuest  
Mel Androus, California Commodity Committee  
Kati Bueler, Western Crop Protection Association (WCPA)  
Ronald Hampton, Western Region IR-4 Program, University of California - Davis  
Mark Tognazzini, California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association  
Karen Heisler, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9  
Sayed Badr, University of California - Fresno, Dept. of Viticulture & Enology  
Barry Wilson, University of California - Davis, Dept. of Environmental Toxicology  
Robert Curtis, California League of Food Processors  
William Thomas, Livingston and Mattesich  
Dawit Zeleke, Nature Conservancy Program for Strategic Pest Management  
Mark Cady, Community Alliance for Family Farmers (CAFF)  
Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation (CRLAF)  
Christine Bruhn, University of California - Davis, Director, Center for Consumer Research  
Kim Crum, California Agricultural Production Consultants Association (CAPCA)  
Cliff Ohmart, Lodi Woodbridge Wine Grape Commission  
Frank Zalom, University of California - Davis, Statewide IPM Program  
Maxwell Norton, UC Cooperative Extension Merced County

**ABSENT MEMBERS (Based on Sign-In Sheets):**

Mark Shelton, CA State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo  
Robert Bugg, University of California – Davis, SAREP  
Steve Pavich, Pavich Farms  
Joel Nelson, California Citrus Mutual  
Tess Dennis, California Farm Bureau Federation  
Terri Olle, Californians for Pesticide Reform  
Robert Baker, Pest Control Operators of California  
Kevin Olsen, Association of Natural BioControl Producers  
Laurie Nelson, Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association  
(1 vacancy)

## **INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT (Based on Sign-In Sheets):**

Artie Lawyer, Technology Sciences Group  
Marcia Kreith, UC Ag Issues  
Jason Chavez, Calif Tree Fruit Agreement  
Lori Berger, Calif Minor Crops  
Terry Cage, Calif Aerial Applicators Association  
Joel Trumbo, Dept. of Fish and Game  
Bill Gillespie, Research Endeavors  
Jim Wells & Ann Downs, JSC California  
Rick Melnicoe, Western Region Pest Management Center  
John Pearson, BASF Corporation  
Mary Louis Flint, University of California - Davis, Statewide IPM Program  
Barbara Todd, California Department of Food and Agriculture

### DPR Staff present:

Paul Gosselin	Nancy Newlin
Steven Monk	Jeanne Martin
Keith Pfeiffer	Bob Elliott
Nan Gorder	Muffet Wilkerson
Mac Takeda	Linda Lichtenberger
Gary Patterson	
Naomi Fualau	

## **AGENDA ITEMS**

### **1. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS AND OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE AND AMENDMENT TO MEETING SUMMARY.**

Paul Helliker opened the meeting and introduced new members of the committee. Paul asked for additions to the agenda. No new items were added. There were no corrections to the previous meeting summary. Paul apologized for not having any background materials available to the committee before the meeting. He also committed that such would not be the case in the future. Paul also gave a brief overview of a press release on DPR's approval of a \$150,000 settlement for the Earlimart incident.

### **2. DPR GUIDANCE ON ACCEPTING HUMAN SUBJECT TEST DATA.**

Paul Gosselin, DPR's Acting Chief Deputy Director, gave an overview on DPR's efforts to develop criteria and guidelines for handling the unsolicited submission of test data from studies using human subjects. Paul explained that DPR plans to conduct further external discussions on this issue. DPR is looking at the issue from two perspectives: when to use the data and how to use it. Paul informed the committee that DPR is not going to develop anything referencing or requiring testing on human subjects. DPR is also looking to develop an internal process that will address the validity of scientific data by having staff review available data.

Gary Patterson, Branch Chief of DPR's Medical Toxicology Branch, reiterated Paul Gosselin's statement that DPR neither requires nor request testing data that involve human testing. He explained that DPR would not use such a study unless the study protocol had been reviewed and approved by an institutional review board. He provided the committee with a draft policy outlining DPR's criteria and guidelines on the subject of test data using human subjects. Gary was asked to define what constitutes an institutional review board. Gary referenced the definition used by EPA and added that it is a group of independent bodies approved by laboratories or regulatory bodies for the purpose of reviewing scientific study protocols. Anne Katten (CRLAF) asked if there was a minority opinion (referring to the review of EPA's SAP document), and if there was, should have been made available also. Artie Lawyer (TSG) also suggests that the Policy should have reflected

the adverse opinions. Gary informed the committee that there was a minority opinion, and it would be made available on the web site. Dr. Barry Wilson commented on the history of unethical and very flawed studies that used human subjects; his point being that this was not a new issue, but rather had an earlier beginning in Scotland.

Anne Katten expressed her concerns that perceived interest in the topic of using human subjects in testing would only encourage more studies of this type. Paul Helliker said that it is an issue that is being considered. Ethical issues are very much our concern, and it is for this reason that we need to look at this type of data. DPR is contemplating having a scientific review panel. If the committee has comments or thoughts on that matter, we would be very happy to hear from you.

### **3. OVERVIEW OF DPR'S E-GOVERNMENT PROJECT.**

Paul Helliker gave an overview on DPR's E-Government project. Paul provided some information regarding the goals and scope of the project. He said that DPR's goal is, to ultimately, have transaction and interaction ability online. To do this, DPR has hired an outside consulting firm, NewPoint Company, to look at DPR's current practices and make recommendations for improvement. Paul informed the committee and others that the consultants should be contacting them in two to three weeks for interviews. Ron Hampton commented that DPR should point to other useful sites with valuable information that are available on the web.

### **4. OVERVIEW OF UPCOMING GRANTS PROCESS AND SCHEDULE.**

Bob Elliott provided insight to key activities coming up in the Grants Proposal Process. Bob said that the process would include review of grant proposals and, new this year, Pest Management Alliance proposals. Bob said that the review process is a three-phase process that would include establishing subcommittees, sorting group proposals by discipline, and assigning them to people in a subcommittee with related expertise. A subcommittee would be made up of PMAC members, DPR, and CDFA staff. Bob also talked about scoring proposals and ranking them in Tiers 1, 2, or 3, 1 being highest and 3 being lowest. Bob informed the committee that the due date for Applied Research and Demonstration grant proposals is October 6, and the due date for Alliance proposals is November 1. Copies of proposals will be mailed to the committee for review. Groups are asked to review in detail only those proposals in their subcommittees.

Bob also informed committee that the December 7 PMAC meeting would be to discuss the subcommittee recommendations and make final recommendations for funding. Bob was asked on the number of proposals that may be received and how much funding was available. He informed the committee that last year, there were 50 grant proposals, and 19 of those were funded. Available funding for grant projects is approximately \$500,000 and funding for Alliance projects is approximately \$800,000. Bob was also asked if a summary of a committee review was made available for those proposals that were not approved. Bob said they would be made available upon request. The committee suggested some ways to improve and increase review time. Some suggestions were: (1) to ask for all required number of copies of proposals in order to eliminate time spent in copying proposals, (2) make processes available online after signature issue is dealt with, (3) continue to conduct workshops that share the successes in Alliance Proposals, and (4), improve the granting cycle.

A question was asked for whom to contact if someone knows of an ongoing project that the Government doesn't know about but should know. Paul Helliker responded that they should contact Bob Elliott or Nan Gorder and they will look into it. Paul also informed the new members that they can pick and choose which subcommittee they wish to participate in and to let Bob Elliott know. A memo that spells out participation requirements and review process will be circulated for new members.

## **5. DEVELOPMENT OF KNOWLEDGE EXPECTATIONS, STUDY GUIDES, AND EXAM QUESTIONS FOR LICENSING PEST CONTROL ADVISORS AND PESTICIDE APPLICATORS.**

Muffet Wilkerson, Supervisor of Licensing and Certification Unit of DPR's Pesticide Enforcement Branch, gave a presentation on the development of knowledge expectations, study guides, and exam questions for licensing pest control advisors and pesticide applicators. She talked about the emerging needs concerning the licensing program and DPR's response to those needs. Muffet stated that the partnership between the University of California – Statewide Integrated Pest Management Program (UC IPM) and DPR is much better compared to other states' partnership. She noted that a valuable part of that is the multi-lingual and multi-cultural practitioner aspect of the partnership. She said that UC IPM products are held up by other states as models. Because the partnership is so successful, DPR is free to focus on compliance and regulatory issues.

Mary Lou Flint, UC IPM Program, talked about the problems and challenges of the licensing and certification program. One of the problem is knowing what it takes to build a legally defensible exam. Some areas to look at are conducting job analysis, evaluating complaints on exam questions' relative to study material, developing a system to measure and evaluate the examination process, how to structure licensing categories and sub-categories, and how to do all that in a way that fosters success.

Mary Lou informed the committee that the new study guides will be out between January and February of 2000. There is, however, still a need for funding in order to complete the development of examinations. Frank Zalom, UC IPM Program, said that the statewide integrated pest management project is the pesticide use applicators training under the UC IPM Program. A question was asked on who looks at the structural pest control. Frank answered that the Department of Consumer Affairs' Structural Pest Control Board oversees that program. Another question was asked about the availability of funding in 2003. Mary Lou said that the program would not be sustainable unless funds are allocated. A question was asked on what the committee can do to help with funding. CAPCA's representative expressed CAPCA's commitment to funding the program. Someone asked where the licensing fees go. Muffett Wilkerson answered that the fees are used to set up exams.

Paul Helliker asked the committee if it would be useful to write to the California representatives, and that the committee should consider getting funding under normal funding mechanisms.

## **6. SETTING THE 2001 MEETING CLENDAR.**

Paul Helliker asked the committee if there was a need to change the structure of the PMAC meetings from quarterly to another time. Everyone agreed to stay with the quarterly cycle in March, June, September, and December.

To schedule the meeting for March 2001, Steven Monk will send out some possible dates. At the same time, committee members are asked to notify Steven of times that are not good for them.

## **7. OTHER BUSINESS, AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURN.**

Paul Helliker announced that the next PMAC meeting is scheduled for December 7, 2000. This meeting will be for discussing grant proposals only.

Requests for copies of the PMAC meeting summary or reports distributed at the PMAC meeting should be directed to Steven Monk at (916) 323-2794, via facsimile at (916) 324-1452 or e-mail at [smonk@cdpr.ca.gov](mailto:smonk@cdpr.ca.gov) or may be mailed to:

Mr. Steven Monk  
Office of Policy Coordination and Continuous Improvement  
Department of Pesticide Regulation  
830 K Street, Room 308  
Sacramento, California 95814-3510

For information about the PMAC, please contact either:  
Bob Elliott, Pest Management Grants and Alliance (916) 324-4156; or  
Steven Monk, for all other issues (916) 323-2794